

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FII	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,181	08/01/2003		Fernando Cardenas	3069/1	4899
23638	7590	10/04/2004	EXAMINER		INER
ADAM EV			HENDERSON, MARK T		
(formerly Adams, Schwartz & Evans, P.A.) 2180 TWO WACHOVIA CENTER				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CHARLOT	ΓE, NC 2	8282	3722		

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/633,181	CARDENAS, FERNANDO				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Mark T Henderson	3722				
The MAILING DATE of this communicati Period for Reply	on appears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica  - If the period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	FION.  CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply bition.  s, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30), y period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS (by statute, cause the application to become ABAND	e timely filed  days will be considered timely.  from the mailing date of this communication.  NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed or	1 .					
·— ·	☐ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for a	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the appli 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction  Application Papers  9) The specification is objected to by the Ex 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	and/or election requirement.  aminer.  accepted or b) □ objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance.  correction is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for f a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority doc 2. Certified copies of the priority doc 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International * * See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in Applic te priority documents have been rece Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	·					
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-93)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO-Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/4/03.</li> </ol>						

Art Unit:

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# **Faxing of Responses to Office Actions**

In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, TC 3700 is encouraging FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (703)872-9306. This practice may be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into TC 3700 will be promptly forwarded to the examiner.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

1. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, since it does not produce a useful, concrete and tangible result.

Art Unit:

Claim 1 is directed to a sheet having mere arrangements of printed matter, i.e., graph lines at different sizes. Mere arrangement of printed matter though seemingly a "manufacture," is rejected as not being within the statutory classes. See *In re Miller*, 418 F.2d 1392, 164 USPQ 46 (CCPA 1969); *Ex parte Gwinn*, 112 USPQ 439 (Bd. App. 1955); and *In re Jones*, 373 F.2d 1007, 153 USPQ 77 (CCPA 1967). See MPEP 706.03(a).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greeley (1,151,782).

Greeley discloses in Fig. 1 and 2, a sheet for writing or drawing comprising a sheet (1) of any size; having a plurality of lines printed on the surface, wherein the lines are positioned to form a plurality of squares covering the surface of the sheet.

Art Unit:

However, Greeley does not disclose wherein the sheet size is: 4.0 inch x 6.0 inch; 3.0 inch x 5.0 inch; 4.0 inch x 4.0 inch; 3 inch x 3.5 inch; 4.0 inch x 4.0 inch; 4.0 inch; 4.0 inch x 4.0 inch; 4.0 inch x 4.0 inch; 4.0 inch

It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to construct the sheet and square size in any desirable size, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to form the sheet and square size in any dimension, since applicant has not disclosed the criticality of having a particular sheet and square size, and invention would function equally as well if sheet was constructed in any dimension.

3. Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tschanz (6,159,329).

Tschanz discloses in Fig. 2-B, a pad for writing or drawing thereon comprising; a plurality of bound rectangular sheets (34) of any desirable size; having a plurality of lines (32) printed on the surface, wherein the lines are positioned to form a plurality of squares covering the surface of the sheet.

However, Tschanz does not disclose wherein the sheet size is: 4.0 inch x 6.0 inch; 3.0 inch x 5.0 inch; 4.0 inch x 4.0 inch; 3 inch x 3.5 inch; 2 inch x 3.5 inch; and wherein the squares are .25 inch x .25 inch.

Art Unit:

It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to construct the sheet and square size in any desirable size, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to form the sheet and square size in any dimension, since applicant has not disclosed the criticality of having a particular sheet and square size, and invention would function equally as well if sheet was constructed in any size.

4. Claims 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tschanz in view of Levin (5,948,494).

Tschanz discloses in Fig. 2-C, a sheet for writing and drawing comprising: a rectangular sheet of paper approximately 8.5 inch x 11.0 inch having removable attached sections (40a - 40f); wherein the section are formed in various sizes; having parallel sections; and having a plurality of lines (32) printed on the surface, wherein the lines are positioned to form a plurality of squares covering the surface of the sheet; and wherein the sheet (42) can be bound (as seen in Fig. 2-C wherein the sheet has holes to be placed in a binder).

However, Tschanz does not disclose: wherein the sheet is perforated to form five removably attached sections; wherein the first section is sized at 2.0 inch x 3.5 inch; second and third sections are sized at  $3.0 \times 5.0$  inch; and fourth and fifth sections are each sized at 4.0 inch x 6.0 inch; wherein first second and third sections are positioned parallel to each other; fourth and

Art Unit:

fifth sections are positioned parallel to each other; and wherein the squares are sized at .25 inch x .25 inch.

Levin discloses in Fig. 1, 2, 9, and 10, a plurality of bound sheets (see Fig. 1) having parallel perforated sections (100, 102, 104, 106) that are removably attached.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Tschanz's sheet with perforated removably attached sections as taught by Levin for the purpose of providing an alternative means in which to holding a number of sheet sections.

In regards to Claims 11, 15, 16 and 18, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to construct the sheet and square size in any desirable size, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to form the sheet and square size in any dimension, since applicant has not disclosed the criticality of having a particular sheet and square size, and invention would function equally as well if sheet was constructed in any size.

In regards to Claims 12 and 13, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the perforated sections at any desirable location on the sheet, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to place the sheet sections in any orientation, since applicant has not disclosed the criticality of having a particular sheet section

Art Unit:

orientation, and invention would function equally as well if the sections were in any desirable orientation.

# Prior Art References

The prior art references listed in the attached PTO-892, but not used in a rejection of the claims, are cited for (their/its) structure. Pitts et al, Riseman, Hoover, and Brunhoefer discloses similar graph sheets. Drake and Tayebi disclose bound sheet sections.

Page 8

Application/Control Number: 10/633,181

Art Unit:

### **Contact Information**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark T. Henderson whose telephone number is (703)305-0189. The examiner can be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:30 AM to 3:45 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner supervisor, A. L. Wellington, can be reached on (703) 308-2159. The fax number for TC 3700 is (703)-872-9302. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 3700 receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-1148.

MTH

September 30, 2004

A. L. WELLINGTON

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700